

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the torsion spring, push-piece body, the hook boss and the limitation on the 90 degree rotation position. The amendments find support, for example, at page 5, lines 23-27 (torsion spring), page 6, lines 14-28 (push-piece body and the hook boss) and page 10, lines 3-10 (the 90 degree position), of the specification. Claim 1 has been also amended to comply with U.S. practice. New claims 2 and 3 find support, for example, at page 4, lines 21-27, and page 6, lines 24-28, of the specification.

The amendments set forth above overcome the objection to claim 1, because the claims are now presented on pages separate from the specification.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) on French Patent Publication No. FR2825983 (Petit) and U.S. Patent No. 1,950,465 (Whitlock). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection in view of the amendments to claim 1.

Claim 1 as amended recites a torsion spring provided in the hinge boss and states that the torsion spring applies a force against the case body so as to urge the cover to open. The Examiner equates Petit's element 21 to the claimed hinge boss, element 2 to the claimed case body and element 3 to the claimed cover. However, Petit's hinge boss 21 is not provided with any torsion spring that would urge Petit's cover 3 to open, contrary to the claim language. See FIGS. 1a -8b of Petit.

Claim 1 further recites a hook mechanism provided on the case body. The Examiner has ignored the claimed hook mechanism in this rejection. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite the limitation of the hook mechanism that the hook mechanism comprises a push-piece body and a hook boss to engage with the push-piece body. Petit's case body 2 includes no such hook mechanism.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to state that the radius reduction portion is so configured that the frictional contact between the pressure member and the hinge boss is less when the cover opens beyond the 90 degree position than when the cover does not reach the 90 degree position. Petit fails to disclose or suggest the claimed 90 degree threshold.

Whitlock fails to cure any of the deficiencies of Petit described above. The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) on Petit and Whitlock should be withdrawn because they do not teach or suggest the claimed invention as a whole.


In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **371312003100**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 4, 2010

By:



Takamitsu Fujiu
Registration No. 63,971

Morrison & Foerster LLP
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 400
McLean, VA 22102-3915
Telephone: (703) 760-7751
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777